



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

| ``.  |                |                      |                        |                  |  |
|--|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO.                              | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
| 09/596,442                                   | 06/19/2000     | Matthew R Perkins    | . CM03017J             | 4005             |  |
| 7:   | 590 11/16/2004 |                      | EXAM                   | INER             |  |
| James A Lamb                                 |                |                      | LY, No                 | LY, NGHI H       |  |
| Motorola Inc                                 |                |                      |                        |                  |  |
| Intellectual Property Section Law Department |                |                      | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| 8000 West Sunrise Boulevard                  |                |                      | 2686                   | in               |  |
| Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33322                     |                |                      | DAME MAIL ED 11/1/2000 | , (0             |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   | 1.7                                     |
|--|--|--|---|
| Advisory Action  | 09/596,442   | PERKINS ET AL.   | 9                                       |
| •  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |   |
|  | Nghi H. Ly   | 2686   |   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence ado                                      | lress                                   |
| THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T<br>Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave<br>final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1)<br>condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal<br>Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment whicl  | ation. A proper repl<br>n places the applica           | ly to a<br>ation in                     |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | <u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]  |  |   |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   | _  |  |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH   | g date of the final rejecti<br>IE FINAL REJECTION.     | ion.<br>See MPEP                        |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | of extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>the later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The app<br>originally set in the final | ropriate extension<br>Office action; or |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR)</li> </ol>   | •  |  |   |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:  |  |   |
| (a)   they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);                                       |   |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);   |  |   |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in<br>issues for appeal; and/or   | n better form for appeal by mate   | rially reducing or si                                  | mplifying the                           |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelling  | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claim                                   | is.                                     |
| NOTE:  |  | •  |   |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject   |  |  |   |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed                                  | amendment                               |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See   |  | dered but does NO                                      | T place the                             |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were                                    | e newly                                 |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |  |  | and an                                  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) objected to:  | •  |  |   |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.   |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   | ** **  |  |   |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr  | oved or b) disapproved by the  | ne Examiner.   |   |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer   | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | Bank-Harold  |   |
| 10. Other:   | Marsha D. B<br>Supervisory 2   | ANKS-HAROLD  COMP EXAMINER  CENTER 2600                |   |
|  | _  |  |   |

Art Unit: 2686

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/23/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 5 and 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Corregan can not be combined into the system of Ishikawa.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to do so found in the references themselves so that the remote terminals may thus be grouped according to channel quality (see Corregan, column 12, lines 44-45). In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 in the previous Office action dated 07/26/2004.

On pages 6 and 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that non of the cited references, Ishikawa, Corregan or Cook, taken individually or combination teaches or suggest "reconfiguring the grouping of radios based on a communication connection statistic".

Art Unit: 2686

The examiner, however, disagrees. As indicated in the previous Office action dated 07/26/2004 that Ishikawa or Corrigan does not specifically disclose reconfiguring the grouping of radios. However, since the *distances, the moving directions, and the moving speeds of the mobile station* (see Ishikawa, column 22, lines 18-22) in the system of Ishikawa varies at time, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Ishikawa such that the group of mobile units are reconfiguring, so that the groups can be associated with the *changing distances, the moving directions, and the moving speeds of the mobile station.* In addition, claim 1 fails to further define what a communication connection statistic is. Therefore, the combination of Ishikawa, Corregan indeed teaches applicant's claimed limitation with the broadest reasonable interpretation. In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 in the previous Office action dated 07/26/2004.

For the above reasons, the examiner believes that the rejections to claims are proper.

## Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (703) 605-5164. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/596,442

Art Unit: 2686

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly